



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/603,665

06/26/2003

Yasuhiro Kawakita

31759-190542

4012

26694

7590

02/01/2007

VENABLE LLP

P.O. BOX 34385

WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998

EXAMINER

KIM, PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/01/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/603,665

Applicant(s)

KAWAKITA ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Kim

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-13 and 15-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office action is responsive to the following communication: Request for Continued Examination filed on 8 November 2006.
2. Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23 are pending and present for examination. Claims 1 and 13 are independent.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8 November 2006 has been entered.

#### ***Response to Amendment***

4. Claims 1, 3-13, 15-16, and 20-21 have been amended.
5. Claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled.
6. Claims 22 and 23 have been added.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
8. **Claims 4-7 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 4-7 and 16 recite a method of determining whether an external data is "sufficiently

Art Unit: 2161

similar" and renders the claims indefinite since it would be unclear to one of ordinary skill in the art what threshold of similarity would equate to external data being "sufficiently similar."

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

10. **Claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1 and 13 are directed to an electronic document information expansion apparatus and method for expanding information on an electronic document. Accordingly, both the apparatus and method claims may be considered to be software, per se, since both claims fail to be integrated into a computer hardware system for execution. Therefore, since the claims simply recite but simply recite sections and steps of implementation, said claims constitute non-statutory subject matter since they fail to fall within a statutory category.

Additionally, Claims 1 and 13 recite the limitations wherein "an information addition section generating additional data to be added to said electronic document using the acquired external data if said relation is found." The aforementioned claim language provides for optional language wherein if said relation is not found, additional data to be added to the electronic document is not generated. Hence, the method would therein produce no "useful, concrete, and tangible result" in that the electronic document is not expanded. See *State Street*, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. MPEP 2106. "The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a 'useful, concrete and tangible result' " (emphasis added).

Art Unit: 2161

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. **Claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 and 20-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Isensee et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,494, hereinafter referred to as ISENSEE), filed on 21 November 1997, and issued on 18 January 2000.

13. **As per independent claims 1 and 13**, ISENSEE teaches:

An electronic document information expansion apparatus (or method) for expanding information on an electronic document comprising:

an input section inputting the electronic document {See ISENSEE, C6:L59-61, wherein this reads over "[p]age 110 has been loaded in a web browser provided according to the present invention for data processing system"};

an information analysis section analyzing and dividing said input electronic document into a plurality of information units {See ISENSEE, Figures 5A-D; and C7:L1-14, wherein this reads over "both pages can be printed together in this nested fashion"}, and extracting from said input electronic document, for each said information unit, location information relating to data including in said information unit indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document {See ISENSEE, C7:L1-14, wherein this reads over "[p]age 110 includes a link 114 to another page 116 in group 112"};

an external data acquisition section acquiring external data for each said information unit from said information source that can be added to the electronic document based on the extracted location information {See ISENSEE, C7:L1-31, wherein this reads over "the contents of page 116 are inserted at the location of link 114 within page 110 (nested within the document)", and determining whether the external data acquired from said information source for each said information unit relates to said data included in said information unit};

an information addition section generating additional data to be added to said electronic document using the acquired external data if said relation is found {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}; and

a structured data generation section combining the data generated by said information addition section with said electronic document, and generating

Art Unit: 2161

structured data with the information on the electronic document expanded {See ISENSEE, C7:L14-31, wherein this reads over "[t]he present invention allows multiple web pages to be combined and displayed together"}.

14. **As per dependent claim 3, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the functions of said external data acquisition section and said information addition section are recursively repeated for additional external data located from additional location information {See ISENSEE, C7:L16-18, wherein this reads over "[t]he present invention allows multiple web pages to be combined and displayed together"; and C7:L47-49, wherein this reads over "a user might desire to quickly expand a page to integrate all directly linked pages (that are available)"}.

15. **As per dependent claim 4, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said external data acquisition section acquires said external data for each said information unit after determining whether said external data is sufficiently similar to said data included in said information unit {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}.

16. **As per dependent claim 5, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 4, wherein said sufficient similarity comprises determining whether a similarity between said external data for each said information unit and said data included in said information unit exceeds a certain threshold {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}.

17. **As per dependent claim 6, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 4, wherein said sufficient similarity comprises determining whether a highest level of similarity<sup>1</sup> exists between said external data for each said information unit and said data included in said information unit exceeds a certain threshold {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}.

18. **As per dependent claim 15, ISENSEE teaches:**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner notes that disclosed invention of Isensee et al allows for "limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory." By allowing for such a limitations, one of ordinary skill in the art could then reasonably interpret and correlate "a highest level of similarity" with limiting incorporation of pages to strictly one directory. That is, external data residing in the same domain, server, and directory would exceed the threshold, while other external data residing in the same domain and server, but a different directory, would fail to meet the threshold.

Art Unit: 2161

The electronic document information expansion method according to claim 13, wherein in said external data acquisition step, the external data that can be reached by tracking the location information up to preset hierarchies is acquired from a location indicated by the location information on the data included in each of the information units {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}.

19. **As per dependent claim 16, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion method according to claim 13, wherein in said external data acquisition step, the external data is acquired after determining whether the external data is similar to one of the electronic document as an information expansion target and a content of each of the information units {See ISENSEE, C7:L57-62, wherein this reads over "[t]he limits of such a multi-level, expanded document might be set by establishing a maximum link depth (e.g. no pages more than 5 links away), or by using more sophisticated methods such as limiting incorporation of pages to those residing in the same domain, server, directory, etc."}.

20. **As per dependent claims 20 and 21, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus (or method) wherein the extracted location information indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document is uniform resource locator (URL) information {See ISENSEE, C7:L1-14, wherein this reads over "[p]age 110 includes a link 114 to another page 116 in group 112"}.

21. **As per dependent claim 22, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said information unit comprises said location information and document text {See ISENSEE, C7:L1-31, wherein this reads over "the contents of page 116 are inserted at the location of link 114 within page 110 (nested within the document)"}

22. **As per dependent claim 23, ISENSEE teaches:**

The electronic document information expansion apparatus according to claim 22, wherein said electronic document comprises a format accessible on the World Wide Web {See ISENSEE, C7:L1-31, wherein this reads over "the contents of page 116 are inserted at the location of link 114 within page 110 (nested within the document)"}, and said location information comprises information pertaining to a location on the World Wide Web {See ISENSEE, C7:L6-9, wherein this reads over "creates new page 118 by merging the hypertext markup language (HTML) from each page 110 and 116 to construct a single document"; and C7:L1-31, wherein this reads over "the contents of page 116 are inserted at the location of link 114 within page 110 (nested within the document)"}

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

23. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2161

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

24. **Claims 5 and 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of Schilit et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,922, hereinafter referred to as SCHILIT), filed on June 19, 1998, and issued on March 12, 2002.

25. **As per dependent claim 5**, ISENSEE, in combination with SCHILIT, discloses an electronic document information expansion apparatus wherein said sufficient similarity comprises determining whether a similarity between said external data for each said information unit and said data included in said information unit exceeds a certain threshold *{See SCHILIT, col. 5, lines 56-59, wherein this reads over "related target portions 22 are identified using the query generated in step S160 by determining the best-matching target portion and which exceeds a predetermined threshold"}.*

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and SCHILIT would disclose an invention which would acquire external data, or "related target portions," only when a similarity exceeds a certain threshold. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by SCHILIT.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that only acquired data, which has a similarity that exceeds a certain threshold, may be used in extracting data relevant to the content of the electronic document.

26. **As per dependent claim 6**, ISENSEE, in combination with SCHILIT, discloses an electronic document information expansion apparatus wherein said sufficient similarity comprises determining whether a highest level of similarity exists between said external data for each said information unit and said data included in said information unit exceeds a certain threshold *{See SCHILIT, col. 5, lines 56-59, wherein this reads over "related target portions 22 are identified using the query generated in step S160 by determining the best-matching target portion and which exceeds a predetermined threshold"}.*



Art Unit: 2161

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and SCHILIT would disclose an invention which would acquire external data having the highest similarity, or "best-matching target portion," to the electronic document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by SCHILIT.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that only acquired data, which has the highest similarity, may be used in extracting data relevant to the content of the electronic document.

27. **Claim 7** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of Bence, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,178, hereinafter referred to as BENCE), filed on December 30, 1999, and issued on November 19, 2002.

ISENSEE teaches the limitations of claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 AND 20-23 for the reasons stated above.

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus which conducts a preprocessing for removing control characters other than a hyperlink, in determining whether the external data is similar to one of the electronic document (claim 7).

28. **As per dependent claim 7**, ISENSEE, in combination with BENCE, would disclose an electronic document information expansion apparatus wherein the external data acquisition section conducts a preprocessing operation for removing predetermined control characters {*See BENCE, col. 2, lines 11-16, wherein this reads over "functions as removing extraneous control characters and correcting for non-standard formatting conventions"*} in determining whether such sufficient similarity exists.

"The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standards Terms, 7<sup>th</sup> Edition" defines a "control character" as "[a] character that initiates some kind of physical control action but is not printed on the output page." Therefore, the Office interprets "control character," as best understood, to encompass, but not limited to, html formatting tags (e.g. "<br>", "<b>", and "<table>") and other tags, not printed on the output page, which may result in some other actions. The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and

Art Unit: 2161

BENCE would disclose an invention which would conduct preprocessing for removing control characters, such as html formatting tags, other than a hyperlink. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by BENCE.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that control characters may be removed prior to the external data acquisition section conducting a preprocessing for extracting keywords.

29. **Claims 8-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of Kanno (U.S. Patent No. 6,671,683, hereinafter referred to as KANNO), filed on June 28, 2001, and issued on December 30, 2003.

ISENSEE teaches the limitations of claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 AND 20-23 for the reasons stated above.

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus wherein the external data acquisition section conducts a preprocessing for extracting a keyword (claim 8).

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus wherein an information addition section extracts a keyword from the external data acquired by said external data acquisition section (claim 9).

30. **As per dependent claim 8**, ISENSEE, in combination with KANNO, would disclose an electronic document information expansion apparatus wherein an external data acquisition section conducts a preprocessing operation for extracting a keyword relating to said external data when determining whether such sufficient similarity exists{*See KANNO, col. 2, lines 31-53, wherein this reads over "calculation of similarity and relevancy is performed according to the following three procedures so as to obtain documents and keywords having higher similarities and relevancies, thereby realizing the similar document retrieval and the relevant keyword extraction"*}.

Art Unit: 2161

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and KANNO would disclose an invention which would conduct preprocessing for extracting a keyword, specifically the calculation of similarity and relevancy of the keywords in the documents obtained. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by KANNO.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that only similar and relevant keywords may be extracted.

31. **As per dependent claim 9**, ISENSEE, in combination with KANNO, would disclose an electronic document information expansion apparatus wherein an information addition section extracts a keyword from the external data acquired by the external data acquisition section *{See col. 2, lines 1-7, wherein this reads over "the LSI [latent semantic indexing] method mechanically extracts a keyword . . . and is now assumed that a total of M kinds of keywords are extracted"}*.

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and KANNO would disclose an invention which would extract a keyword, through use of a "keyword extraction method which is not limited to a specific one but a known method" already in use, from the external data acquired by the external data acquisition section. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by KANNO.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that only similar and relevant keywords may be extracted, and the later expansion of information contained on an electronic document.

32. **Claim 10** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of KANNO, and in further view of Nonomura et al (USPGPUB 2002/0143742, hereinafter referred to as NONOMURA), filed on March 30, 2001, and published on October 3, 2002.

ISENSEE teaches the limitations of claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 AND 20-23 for the reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2161

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus wherein the structured data generation section combines a keyword extracted from a content of each of the information units with the keyword extracted from the external data, and generates structured data (claim 10).

33. **As per dependent claim 10**, ISENSEE, in combination with NONOMURA, discloses an electronic document information expansion apparatus, wherein the structured data generation section combines a keyword extracted from a said data of each of the information units with the keyword extracted from the external data, and generates said structured data therefrom {*See, Fig. 12; Fig. 43, step S104-105; Fig. 56; Para. 0324, wherein this reads over "[t]he retrieval request processing device 3 combines results obtained in step S102 to generate an XML document as a retrieval result"; and Para. 0375-376, wherein this reads over "[the structured] document shown in Fig. 56 starts from having a component having tag name (component name) 'paper' . . . "*

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and NONOMURA would disclose an invention which would combine keywords from the information units and external data, in order to generate structured data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by NONOMURA.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that a structured data, containing keyword tags, may be generated and output.

34. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of KANNO and NONOMURA, and in further view of Al-Kazily et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,694, herein after referred to as AL-KAZILY) filed on March 21, 2001, and issued on July 6, 2004.

ISENSEE teaches the limitations of claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 AND 20-23 for the reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2161

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus wherein the structured data generation section generates structured data while discriminating a keyword from an information unit from a keyword extracted from external data (claim 11).

35. **As per dependent claim 11**, ISENSEE, in combination with NONOMURA and AL-KAZILY, discloses an electronic document information expansion apparatus according, wherein the structured data generation section generates structured data while discriminating said keyword extracted from a said data of each of the information units from said keyword extracted from the external data {*See AL-KAZILY, col. 8, lines 17-26, wherein this reads over "system and application software 222 . . . to parse a content source for keywords, identify and select certain keywords from the content source based on the type of the content source, and associate the keywords with the content source. The database is then updated to include the identified keywords and references to the content sources that include the keywords"*}.}

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE, NONOMURA, and AL-KAZILY would disclose an invention which would generate structured data while discriminating keywords, as best understood by the Office within the context of the claims, by associating the keywords with the content source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by NONOMURA and AL-KAZILY.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so as to enable selecting a search target in searching the information unit.

36. **Claim 12 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ISENSEE, in view of Maeda et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,973, 458, hereinafter referred to as MAEDA), filed on June 29, 1999, and issued on December 6, 2005.

ISENSEE teaches the limitations of claims 1, 3-6, 13, 15-16 AND 20-23 for the reasons stated above.

Art Unit: 2161

ISENSEE differs from the claimed invention in that ISENSEE fails to disclose an apparatus wherein the electronic document is an e-mail document (claims 12 and 17).

37. **As per dependent claims 12 and 17**, ISENSEE, in combination with MAEDA, discloses an apparatus (also a method) wherein the electronic document is an e-mail document *{See MAEDA, col. 11, lines 18-30, wherein this reads over "inputs the transmission requested e-mail into the document important item extraction device . . . [and] analyzes the structure of the e-mail which is a structured document"}*.

The combination of inventions disclosed in ISENSEE and MAEDA would disclose an invention wherein the electronic document is an email document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above invention suggested by ISENSEE by combining it with the invention disclosed by MAEDA.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this modification so that the contents of e-mails, which is a subcategory of electronic documents, may be analyzed and augmented accordingly.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

38. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-13, and 15-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which were necessitated by Amendment.

#### ***Conclusion***


39. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Kim whose telephone number is (571) 272-2737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on (571) 272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Kim  
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161  
TECH Center 2100

  
Amir Mofiz  
Supervisor, Art Unit 2161